

Remarks

Reconsideration and reversal of the rejections expressed in the Office Action of December 13, 2006 are respectfully contended in view of the following remarks and the application as amended. The present invention relates generally to composite wrap materials for use as a protective covering in a variety of applications, and methods of making the composite wrap materials. More particularly, the invention relates to composite wrap materials used for packaging paper products.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 9-12 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Wittosch et al. and further in view of Finestone et al. These claims have been cancelled, in favor of new claims 25-42, as will be discussed below. Note that the identification in the claims of the layers as having inner and outer surfaces is not new matter; such aspects are necessarily present in the specification of the present application. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that such aspects are inherent in Applicants' disclosure. Tronzo v. Biomet, Inc., 156 F.3d 1154, 1159 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Support for such claims is found throughout the specification of the present application. For instance, paragraph [0023] of the present application is as follows:

*[0023] In use, one side of the wrap material is placed next to the paper or other material being wrapped. The other side of the wrap material may be printed upon using known printing techniques, or the paper layer 15 or film layer 20 can be printed before lamination, and then laminated so the print shows through the film layer. (emphasis added)*

The claims submitted with this Amendment and Response derive 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 1 support from this disclosure, e.g., new claim 25 states: "...the inner surface of said second layer of polymer film material is printed before lamination."

Note that there is no teaching or suggestion in the references, alone or in combination, of a composite wrap material as disclosed and presently claimed, wherein the inner surfaces of either the first layer of paper or the second layer of polymer film material are printed before lamination.

The Examiner's attention is directed to Wittosch et al. at column 3, lines 63-67, as follows: *"In other applications, the coating may be applied to the opposite side of a clay coated substrate and used as a label, where the clay coated side provides a printable surface and the invention coating provides barrier characteristics to the resulting container."* (emphasis added) As taught in Wittosch et al., printing on the surface of a formed laminate is the conventional approach in the art. Indeed, Applicants have proceeded contrary to the teachings of the prior art in their invention as disclosed and presently claimed.

The admitted prior art similarly provides no teaching or suggestion of Applicants' presently claimed invention; furthermore, Finestone et al. at column 2, lines 15-18 states the following: *"B. The paper facing of the laminate sheeting has a high affinity for standard printing inks, so that the products made therefrom can readily be printed and colored."* (emphasis added) This is yet another example of the state of the prior art, in which printing follows lamination; Applicants respectfully reiterate that they have proceeded contrary to the state of the art in their invention as disclosed and presently claimed. Thus, the above rejections are overcome.

For all of the above reasons, it is respectfully contended that the solicited claims define patentable subject matter. Reconsideration and reversal of the rejections expressed in the Office Action of December 13, 2006 are respectfully submitted. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if any questions arise during the course of reconsideration of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/13/07

Richard A. Paikoff  
Richard A. Paikoff  
Reg. No. 34,892  
Duane Morris LLP  
30 South 17<sup>th</sup> Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196  
tel. 215-979-1853

DM2\1038108.1